UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,436	10/621,436 07/16/2003 Mark R. Nelson		062891.1144	1727
5073 BAKER BOTT	7590 04/10/200 S L.L.P.	EXAMINER		
2001 ROSS AV	-	SOL, ANTHONY M		
SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 7	75201-2980	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2619	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/621,436	NELSON ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ANTHONY SOL	2619		

	ANTHONY SOL	2619	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		: FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reig	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	oncoponaning names or many roje		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alle	•	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Wing F Chan/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619 3/31/08			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that Allan never discloses that network device 14 when implemented as a telephone can serve Web pages or otherwise provide content for presentation in a graphical user interface on a client. The Applicant is reminded that the Final Rejection mailed 2/7/2008 in regards to independent claims 1, 9, and 15 is a 103 rejection that relies on Shachar for providing the GUI presentation. The Applicant further argues that it is not obvious that Allan's telephone can act as a web server. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, the independent claims do not recite a web server, but rather a server that transmits content in a GUI format. As discussed above, the rejection relies on Shachar for the GUI presentation. The Applicant still further argues that there is no teaching in either reference or in combination for a telephone to "receive a request from the client via the network interface to execute a telephone-related option selected by the user of the client in the graphical user interface" and "execute the requested telephone-related option." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In the Background of the Invention section of Allan, he clearly points out that the major objective of his invention is to "have a home network VISIBLE to the rest of Internet...each device on the network could SEND and RECEIVE information using the Internet" (emphasis added)(see Allan, col. 1, lines 12-29). The word visible suggests a GUI presentation. However, even if that was not the case, the rejection relies on Shachar for the GUI presentation as discussed above. Allan also discloses an objective to have "one device that may receive instructions from another, or multiple devices could be controlled REMOTELY by a third device. Further, it may be desirable to have this home network to have access to, and be ACCESSED BY, THE OUTSIDE WORLD" (see Allan, col. 1, lines 12-29)(emphasis added). Furthermore, Allan in a section describing an embodiment of his invention, particularly the server aspect of his device, states that a "[a] server application is something like telephony, e-mail or WEB PAGE HOSTING in which the combination of an IP address and a "well known port number" serves as the traditional point of contact to serve the outside world" (see Allan, col. 5, lines 30-49)(emphasis added). The Applicant still further argues that telephone 100 of Shachar does not act as a "local internal server" eventhough the Applicant cites Shachar's col. 13, lines 55-62, where it clearly states, "this operational aspect of the invention can serve as a local internal server for hypertext documents it supports." The Applicant uses col. 12, lines 25-31 to support his contention where it states, "Full hypertext "browsing" capability is provided with the present invention.". After reading the disclosure of Shachar it is readily apparent that telephone 100 has both browsing and server capabilities. The Applicant still further argues that Shachar's telephone 100 is not a server since a server provides content to a remotely located client, which the Applicant alleges that telephone 100 does not. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Shachar discloses "that even remote hypertext documents may include a hyperlink to a local resource within an instance of HTOS" and "a part of the HTOS that is capable of playing tunes would play a tune that is locally available in memory (Shachar, col. 14, lines 55-61). The phrases "local resource" and "locally available in memory" suggest a server operation. The Applicant, in summary, points out that Shachar never contemplates serving the hypertext documents to a remote location to enable remote control of telephone 100 and Allan does not suggest any sort of remote operation of network device 14. The Examiner respectfully disagrees as it has been pointed out above that Shachar suggests some server capabilities of his telephone 100 and Allan discloses remote operations of his device from another device as discussed above.